Vol. X, No. 28 HUMAN EVENTS July 15, 1953

DIALOGUE WITH A D.A.

By PAUL JONES

"I AM NOT a District Attorney", said my visitor, as I looked at his card. "I am a Devil's Advocate."

"Of course", I said. "You appear for the Devil in proceedings for canonization. It is your duty to bring up unfavorable testimony against the reputation for candidates for sainthood."

"Precisely."

"And who is the new saint?"

"The UN. I have come to see you in connection with a miracle alleged to have been performed by the UN in Korea for Syngman Rhee."

"Don't mention that ungrateful old man."

"You find him lacking in gratitude?"

"Certainly. Didn't we save him and his country in 1950? Where would he be without us — I mean without UN?"

"Let us understand each other. Suppose you saved a man from drowning three years ago. Would he be an ingrate today if he declined to let you push him under a subway train?"

"We only set out to stop aggression, and you must admit we succeeded."

"Which aggression?" the D.A. asked.

"Why, the North Korean attack in June, 1950."

"But there was another one", he said. "The UN first declared North Korea an aggressor, and then, in the spring of 1951, made a second declaration, naming Red China as an aggressor. We are now back at the 38th Parallel, and, if you like, that cancels the first aggression. But how about the second one? Dr. Rhee faces a new enemy, Red China. The UN conveniently forgets that aggression. It is very much in Dr. Rhee's mind. He finds it a little peculiar that the UN even talks of admitting Red China to membership, although Korea is not now a member and has small chance of election in any foreseeable future."

"But all the global-minded editorials tell me that Rhee is stubbornly blocking the peace for which the whole world is yearning."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"What peace would there be for him? Dr. Rhee is, so to speak, the last man in the droshky pursued by wolves. The difficulty lies in persuading him to jump, rather than be pushed out, to engage the wolves' attention, while the rest of us whip up the horses and gain time."

"You put things very dramatically. He has our promise that we will continue to strive by all peaceful, political means for the unification of Korea. Does he doubt our word?"

"It is not that he does not believe you", said the D.A. "It is just that he is an old man and has been around a long time, since the first meeting of the ROK Provisional Government at the Little Theater at Philadelphia in 1919. He has cooled his heels in anterooms all over the world, beginning with the Versailles Conference, and going all through the League of Nations to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations in 1945. He must have seen a dozen ex-statesmen, many of them with written promises in their pockets, who had all accepted vague general statements of good will instead of holding out for ironclad guarantees. He knows, I imagine, every one of the dispossessed prime ministers and presidents who are such a nuisance to the UN Secretariat, with their absurd petitions and their talk of rights."

"SURELY this is different."

"How different? Churchill is the same Churchill who went to war for the integrity of Poland and wound up scolding the leader of the Polish government-in-exile in the garden of 10 Downing Street, because the Poles thought the liberty of their wretched country was worth risking the friendship of the Soviet Union. Perhaps Churchill could get a letter of endorsement from Premier Mikolajczyk of Poland. Or maybe, through a medium, the ghosts of Mikhailovitch in Yugoslavia and Benes in Czechoslovakia might advise Dr. Rhee to go along quietly."

"But he's unreasonable, if he imagines we will keep on fighting."

"He says nothing about the UN staying in the fight. He just says *he* will, that he has no choice. You really must look at his point of view. Charles Darwin, in the *Voyage of the Beagle,* describes a miserable tribe of Indians on Tierra del Fuego. When times were hard and food was really scarce, they kept themselves alive by eating the older members of the tribe. Darwin says that an old man or an old woman, sitting at the campfire, might catch a certain appraising glance from the eyes of the younger Indians. Then the old victim slipped away from the bright circle of light and went away alone, into the cold and darkness, anywhere, rather than stay and be eaten, for the benefit of the community.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Very wrong of him, to be sure, and so may Dr. Rhee be very wrong and very unsocial. But not, I think, unreasonable."

"But his cause is utterly hopeless. He is merely condemning his country to death."

"Do you recall the speech made by Winston Churchill in 1940? The one about how England would fight on the beaches, and in the fields, and at every crossroads, even though they had nothing to fight with, except empty bottles?"

"I have always admired that defiance of any enemy that looked all-powerful at the moment."

"And why is it disgraceful for Rhee to trumpet defiance under circumstances so very similar? Can it be that the UN has one standard for Europeans and another for Asiatics?"

"No, no. The UN is dead against all forms of discrimination."

"Then why isn't Rhee hailed as a hero?"

"Because he released 25,000 anti-Communist prisoners just when we were on the point of signing the original truce."

"A truce arranged in meetings from which he was excluded. And what makes you think a truce would have been signed then? This talk about truce has been going on for two years. People who are peaceful-minded have no difficulty in arranging for peace. We must conclude that the Reds dragged out the negotiations because they had some other purpose than peace. Perhaps Rhee's attitude was due to his knowledge of Red tactics."

"But why did Rhee upset the truce by liberating 25,000 anti-Communists?"

"Isn't that what we all want, the liberation of anti-Communists?"

"But not in that way."

"There is only one way to liberate people", said the D.A., "and that is to liberate them. Can there be a wrong time to give freedom to people on our side?"

"He broke his word", I said. "Rhee had put his army under UN control."

"Let me remind you that, since the Nuremberg trials, we have proclaimed a new concept of how far a leader may escape punishment by saying that he merely obeyed orders. We hanged a dozen or so war criminals who made that plea. We said that they should have consulted their conscience and the great principles of natural law, not their hidebound concept of hierarchial authority."

"You are confusing the issue."

"NOT AT ALL. The UN confused and befogged a straight issue of right and wrong. Thus, they persuaded the United States that it would be tactless to mention the 8,000 American prisoners (Defense Department estimates) slaughtered in cold blood by the Reds. We must forget them and concentrate instead on 25,000 Koreans liberated by their own President, describing his act as if it were an injustice.

"There was a chance for our celebrated propaganda outfits to tell the Communists that on our side the freely elected chief of a democratic nation still retains some liberty of action, that he is neither a puppet nor a satellite. Instead, the air whined with regrets

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and explanations and apologies, as if Dr. Rhee had committed a crime. I am a specialist, you understand, in miracles. I find that the UN passed no miracle. But I am inclined to think that Dr. Rhee did."

"And what was his miracle?"

"Consider. Until he freed the 25,000 anti-Communists, Britain had been saying that her contribution, a gallant one, by the way, to the fighting forces in Korea was all she could manage. But, after Rhee acted, Churchill told the House that he was considering sending reinforcements to Korea, presumably to help round up and jail 25,000 free men.

"Yet, the truce talks themselves had produced something even more remarkable. India, whose total contribution to the UN effort in Korea had been, in three years, one ambulance team, now agreed to dispatch 5,000 troops, for the sole purpose of making sure that 25,000 anti-Communists were not liberated until after thorough identification and brain-washing by Red experts. On a number of occasions since June, 1950, the UN command could have used 5,000 Gurkhas or Sikhs. But they were not forthcoming, except as prison camp guards. What folly!"

"Surely", I said uncomfortably, "everybody is doing the best he can, except that old obstructionist Rhee."

"Think what you are saying", the D.A. said. "For years now, we have heard little but envious admiration of the way the Communists had gripped the imagination of Asia. We could not say enough about the enthusiasm of Communist youth and their fanatical determination to do or die for the things they believe. If only the democratic ideal could inspire the will to sacrifice as Marxism did! If only Point Four seeds and Fulbright lecturers were more magnetic!"

"What are you getting at now?" I asked suspiciously.

"Well, here is a nation on our side, thoroughly Asiatic, and willing to die rather than submit to Communism. Their leader was trained and educated in America, a veteran Wilsonian liberal, who took his Ph.D. in Woodrow Wilson's last year as President of Princeton. Old as he is, he has gripped the imagination of Koreans and become the symbol of undying resistance to tyranny. So, instead of backing him up, instead of saying 'This is what we stand for', we spend our time denouncing his 'treachery' and his 'bad faith', because he acts on our principles, and not the enemy's. What a lesson for Asia, and for the rest of the world!"

"It is a strange situation", I admitted.

"Strange indeed", said the D.A. "We are like a contortionist who can't untangle himself. We have completely reversed ourselves. What we now tell the world, as we told the world when we dismissed MacArthur, is: 'We have nothing to fear — but courage'."

Mr. Paul Jones has been doing editorials for the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* for the last dozen years. He has also contributed articles to *Colliers* and the *Saturday Evening Post.*

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10 00: 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 28 Wednesday, July 15, 1953 Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED JUL 24 53

To Save Russia: The only cogent explanation of many events which have crowded in upon us these recent weeks is that a tremendous drive is on to save Soviet Russia. That colossal tyranny has reached a stage where its evils and weaknesses now, in the time of dynastic change, threaten its stability. Many observers wonder whether the whole structure might not crash at any time. Yet great efforts are being made — and by the same people who launched the anti-Red crusade — to shore up the creaking edifice and to ensure its survival.

Churchill is the leader of this drive. He apparently feels that Britain has a vested interest in the Soviet Union's survival. In view of the Churchillian strategy of "playing the middle" between the two major powers, the U.S. and USSR, the Prime Minister would definitely be thrown off his pitch if something happened to Russia. Then, he would presumably have no leverage on the bountiful Treasury of the U.S.A.

It is less easy to see why the leaders of the U.S., who have combatted Soviet Russia in the cold war, spilled American blood and treasure in the more recent hot war in Korea, should wish to join in the bolstering of an enemy whose menace to us they described in melodramatic terms. Nevertheless, if our leaders do so, it will not be for the first time. It is well to recall that on two previous occasions, the U.S. took steps which effectively saved the USSR — after which the latter continued, as before, to plot the undermining and downfall of the benefactor.

On July 5, 1944, HUMAN EVENTS, discussing the economic and especially the monetary situation of those days, recalled some historical facts. Mentioning the Roosevelt gold purchase policy, initiated in 1934, we noted that the Soviet Union had profited by the move. "The Soviet Union", we remarked, "had suffered from a deficit in its export-import balance for years. But the rise in the gold price, by American action, enabled the gold-producing Soviet Union overnight to wipe out its deficit. The 'prosperity' period of 1934-6, so often hailed by Soviet sympathizers, was actually greatly in debt to the American currency move. In fact, some observers say: 'The United States has saved the Soviet Union *twice:* in 1934 by its purchase of gold at $15 an ounce greater than the hitherto prevailing market price and next, by the American-inspired second front in France in June, 1944'."

Today, we have another chance — perhaps just one more chance, to look after our own survival.

The McCarthy Angle: This drive to save Soviet Russia has had its effects on the domestic front, although few here recognize them. The heightened tempo, the shriller tones and the increasingly desperate methods of the fight against Senator McCarthy are symptoms that the Kremlin's apparatus in the U.S. is working frantically. It is not too difficult to see why. McCarthy by his exposures might endanger various moves to save the USSR from a crack-up. Therefore, the Kremlin apparatus here has undoubtedly redoubled its efforts to destroy the man from Wisconsin.

This development recalls a parallel with a certain phase in the Hiss case, when the same elements released a drive to destroy Hiss' accuser, Whittaker Chambers. The latter in his famous autobiography, *Witness,* described the situation: "The Communist Party did not need to move openly against me. It had only to sit back, to give a quiet turn here, to prompt my enemies there, to feed out information, some of

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it true and damaging, but most of it slanderous and false, to iterate that most potent of falsehoods: that nobody can believe an ex-Communist — and the powers hostile to me, that the Hiss Case had set in motion, would do the rest."

And as Chambers elsewhere in his book explains, he had done more than offend the Kremlin, he had come in conflict with something related thereto but even more formidable. "When I took up my little sling and aimed at Communists, I also hit something else. What I hit was the forces of that great socialist revolution, which, in the name of liberalism, spasmodically, incompletely, somewhat formlessly, but always in the same direction, has been inching its ice cap over the nation for two decades. . . . No one could have been more dismayed than I at what I had hit, for though I knew it existed, I still had no adequate idea of its extent, the depth of its penetration or the fierce vindictiveness of its revolutionary temper, which is a reflex of its struggle to keep and advance its political power."

"The fierce vindictiveness" was demonstrated in the past week in the almost incredible (except to those who have watched the forces at work for years on Martin Dies, Parnell Thomas, Whittaker Chambers and others) smearing of Mr. J. B. Matthews, who resigned as chief counsel from the McCarthy committee after charges that he had maligned the Protestant clergy. Mr. David Lawrence, the columnist, has shown clearly and textually how Matthews had said nothing of the kind about the Protestant clergy, how he pointed his finger at only about 3 per cent of the Protestant clergy in this country who were dupes, Communists or fellow-travellers and specifically stated that the vast majority of the clergy are loyal Americans much embarrassed by the participation of a small minority in the sinister world-wide conspiracy. These facts were completely ignored in the statement by President Eisenhower and in the letter from three clergymen of the Interfaith movement. Bad reporting — or was it intentionally bad? — had succeeded in spreading the impression that Matthews had attacked the Protestant clergy as a whole.

Revolt in Germany: The first American blow in psychological warfare (belated, but sound) has obviously struck a tender point in the Red setup. Our offer of $15 million of foodstuffs for Eastern Germany was sharply and angrily turned down by the Kremlin. The Soviet refusal provides our propaganda agencies with a good chance to broadcast the facts of the story to Eastern Germany. The consequences of public reaction among the Germans cannot be helpful to the shaky Red puppet regime.

Experts here in Washington talk of another opportunity to "make hay". Mr. Isaac Don Levine, in a piece in the Scripps Howard Washington *Daily News*, on July 11, suggested that the fall of Beria may have important results, in this respect: Beria's large secret service network may contain a number of agents in the satellite countries, who fear that they may meet the fate of their recent chief and so might be prepared to desert. As Levine says: "It would not be surprising if even hundreds of Beria's men abroad were to defect to our side, bringing with them a fund of information on the state of Soviet defenses."

Finally, much discussion here centers on another valuable source of intelligence which at present is not being utilized by our services. That is the Free Polish intelligence service which functions in London under the celebrated General Anders, who commanded the Poles during the last war. Anders is respected and treated well by the British, but in the present pro-Soviet phase of British policy, he is not given any help there. The excellence of Anders' information is recalled in the fact that early in 1950 he warned the U.S. Department of Defense that a Red attack would be launched against Southern Korea about July 1 of that year. Around Washington many feel that a great help to our official knowledge of what goes on behind the Iron Curtain would be obtained if Anders were invited to visit Washington.

Not Merely Gossip: In the past twenty-four hours, Secretary Dulles has been figuratively wearing a feather in his cap for his success in beating down Churchill's ideas at the 3-Power Foreign Ministers con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference just concluded. As a matter of fact, the Secretary had to compromise considerably. But the upshot is that there will be no Bermuda meeting (as Churchill wanted), nor is there any agreement (as Churchill demanded) for a four-power conference of heads of state, to include Malenkov or whoever happens to be alive in the Kremlin at the time. Finally, Dulles apparently won an agreement (from the British and French) to "demand true liberty (be) restored to the countries of Eastern Europe", citing the East German uprisings as "proof of the will to independence". In the halls of the State Department, the Secretary's stock has risen and there is no talk today about "how long Dulles will last".

● Is Mrs. Anna Rosenberg due for an appointment in the Eisenhower Administration? It is rumored that the former lady administrator of War Manpower was recently in the nation's capital and called on two top men — "Beedle" Smith, Undersecretary of State and long a friend of hers, and on Attorney General Herbert Brownell. If the rumors about the appointment of Mrs. Rosenberg have some substance, her appointment might well run into heavy weather when up for confirmation by Congress. Mrs. Rosenberg was closely associated with both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations and there are many members of Congress who would consider her as ineligible, as simply a "Truman holdover".

● The naming of Admiral Lewis Strauss to head the Atomic Energy Commission comes as good news to security-conscious officers of the Government. Strauss is a patriotic American who served for some years as a member of the commission. He was of great aid and comfort to those who sought to nail down security regulations and to get rid of security risks. Strauss is a conservative, a life-long friend and protegee of former President Hoover and a long-time supporter of Senator Taft.

Socialism As Is: The *New York Times* runs an item on its financial page (July 12) that could form the basis of a sermon on socialism, American brand. It tells about the concern of the Rural Electrification Administration over "the financial condition of many cooperatives faced with mounting debt payments". And it quotes one of these officials as urging these cooperatives to "get out and push" sales of electric power, so that their income might enable them to meet their obligations. To whom do the cooperatives owe money? Why, the government.

Nearly 1,000 of these power-supplying cooperatives have been established since 1936 with REA loans. This year, principal and interest payments to the tune of $58 million are due. Next year the amount will be $71 million and in 1956 the cooperatives will have to come across with $96 million. There are indications that the cooperatives, or some of them, will have trouble meeting these obligations. "The last available report on REA cooperative operations showed 27 per cent reporting operating deficits for the calendar year 1951." It must be kept in mind that these "operating deficits" do not include taxes, which the cooperatives are not required to pay.

Of course, if these cooperatives default on their payments to the government there is little likelihood of foreclosure; the rural vote is too precious to be jeopardized by cutting off its subsidized house lights. The "general public" will foot the bill. If the government should foreclose, the American people will be put into the power and light business permanently, and will be saddled with a continuing annual deficit. Why not? The farmers must have cheap light.

The story does not say anything about the sequel to this governmental venture into the power and light business. For the past two years Congress has been reducing the appropriations to REA. Is this agency preparing to wind up its operations? Not a bit of it. Bureaucrats are past masters at perpetuating their useless jobs, and this agency has done so by transferring its interest to rural telephone expansion. It has made loans to both private and cooperative telephone companies in rural areas, and is now hoping that farmers' wives will not stint their use of the family telephone, so that the government may recover something on these loans — eventually.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bricker Amendment: Felix Morley, in a new pamphlet "Treaty Law and the Constitution", sees the issue raised by the Bricker Amendment in the light of 16th Century history. He recalls the words of Bishop Latimer, as he went to death at the stake, saying "We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out." Queen Mary of England, "Bloody Mary", burned Latimer, Cranmer and Ridley at the stake in an effort to crush the Protestant Reformation, an activity not disagreeable to her husband who was Philip II, His Catholic Majesty of Spain. As a result of Mary's alliance, with Spain, the port of Calais, long held by England, was captured by the French. Mary sorrowfully remarked that when she died she hoped the name of Calais would be graven on her heart.

"As the American diplomat-historian, Carlton J. H. Hayes — himself a Catholic — has written: 'Patriotic French and English alike resented the attempt of Philip and Mary to control their domestic affairs. The eventual failure of Philip registered a wonderful growth of national feeling among the peoples who victoriously contended against him. The beginnings of the real modern greatness of France and England date from their struggle with Philip II'."

Morley goes on to comment: "History never repeats itself exactly. But history does chronicle the similar reactions of human beings to similar problems and pressures at different times. The year 1553 saw the beginning of a significant English revolt against arbitrary executive direction of foreign policy. The year 1953 is witnessing a fundamentally similar protest movement in the United States."

Morley sees the people behind the Bricker measure as composing such a movement and remarks: "Its strength is found in much the same nationalistic sentiment which four centuries ago inspired Bishop Latimer to face a dreadful death unflinchingly. And the direct appeal of the movement is to those Americans — and they are many — who have not Calais, but Korea graven on their hearts." ("Treaty Law and the Constitution — a Study of the Bricker Amendment", by Felix Morley, is published and distributed by the American Enterprise Association, Inc., 4 East 41st Street, New York 17, N.Y., 1317 F Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. Price: 50 cents.)

On Book Burning: Dorothy Thompson, in one of her columns last week, made a point which (outside our own original comment a month ago on the "burning" uproar) has unfortunately been widely ignored. "There are several ways of 'burning books'," says Miss Thompson. "One can take them out of libraries, or keep them out in the first place. I noticed that eight pro-Communist or anti-Chiang books on China were involved in recent bans. If the object were to represent American views, some of these books should be included. But so, also, should books representing the opposite viewpoint, such as General Chennault's account, Father Mark Tennien's *No Secret is Safe*, Freda Utley's *The China Story*, George Creel's *Russia's Race for Asia* and John B. Powell's *My Twenty-five Years in China*. I do not know which of these are on the shelves, but I do know that Freda Utley's is not. Bert Andrews' *Washington Witch Hunt* has been banned. No book by John T. Flynn was ever accepted.

"Six years ago, the late Oswald Garrison Villard published, in *The Progressive*, the article 'Book Burning, American Style', denouncing the systematic suppression by certain critics, book sellers and log rollers of every book challenging the Roosevelt Administration's prewar and post-war diplomacy. 'To condemn books by deliberately ignoring them or to choose critics who are known in advance to be certain to attack a book is neither to serve literature, nor the truth, nor to play the game honestly and fairly', said Mr. Villard."

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED